arXiv:quant-ph/0603102v3 30 Jun 2009

Geometric multipartite entanglement measures

Gerardo A. Paz-Silva[1, *] and John H. Reina[1, 2, †]
[1]*Departamento de Física, Universidad del Valle, A.A. 25360, Cali, Colombia*
[2]*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Universität Berlin, Hardenbergstr. 36, 10623 Berlin, Germany*

(Dated: June 30, 2009)

Within the framework of constructions for quantifying entanglement, we build a natural scenario for the assembly of multipartite entanglement measures based on Hopf bundle-like mappings obtained through Clifford algebra representations. Then, given the non-factorizability of an arbitrary two-qubit density matrix, we give an alternate quantity that allows the construction of two types of entanglement measures based on their arithmetical and geometrical averages over all pairs of qubits in a register of size N, and thus fully characterize its degree and type of entanglement. We find that such an arithmetical average is both additive and strongly super additive.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Lx
Keywords: Quantum entanglement; Hopf fibrations; Entanglement measures; Quantum information

Quantum entanglement is arguably the most intriguing feature of the quantum world, the hallmark of nonlocal correlations that draws the line between classical and quantum behaviour [1]; it is also the very resource that allows quantum computation [2], and quantum protocols such as teleportation [3] and key distribution [4] to be performed. Since information can, in principle, be processed by quantum technologies via the manipulation of a given set of physical resources [1], an important problem to be addressed is the quantification and controlled manipulation of the degree of entanglement of a continuously interacting physical system [5]. In this context, we should be capable of performing a reliable measure in order to account for the quantification and processing of the system's degree of quantum correlations at a given time. Many efforts have been devoted towards this objective, ranging from polynomial invariants [6, 7, 8], density matrix properties [5, 9, 10], and positive maps [11], to geometrical/algebraic approaches [12, 13, 14].

In this Letter we give a geometric formulation of multipartite entanglement measures. In so doing, we construct a Hopf bundle like mapping which allows us to obtain information about the entanglement of a pure quantum state. The idea of using Hopf fibrations has been explored by several authors in the context of the generalization of Bloch spheres to higher dimensions [15, 16, 17]. The two qubit case has an interesting interpretation in terms of the second Hopf fibration [17]. The three qubit case, although explored [15, 16], has not been fully understood. Here we give the formulation for the three qubit case and generalize it to an N-qubit system. This implies a technical challenge since Hopf fibrations cannot be faithfully constructed in higher dimensions. We propose a generalization in terms of Clifford algebra representations, and build a Hopf-like map which gives information about the system's entanglement. Moreover, we introduce the permutation group to decode the information available to *all* qubits in the system. This geometrical picture provides a natural setting for the Meyer-Wallach entanglement measure [6]. We also propose, to avoid some inconveniences posed by the Meyer-Wallach measure, an alternate strategy to quantifying multipartite entanglement. We introduce the idea of probe quantities to characterize the non-factorizability of each two-qudit density matrix within a pure quantum state and build on it to construct two entanglement measures, that can also account for the case of mixed states, by means of their geometrical and arithmetical averages. We study their basic properties and implications. We find that the proposed arithmetical average is both additive and strongly super additive.

Two-qubit entanglement and the second Hopf fibration.—We construct the two-qubit case following Ref. [17], but fixing the state norm to 1. The state vector can be written in the computational basis as $|\Psi\rangle = \alpha_0|00\rangle + \alpha_1|01\rangle + \beta_0|10\rangle + \beta_1|11\rangle$, where $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_0, \beta_1 \in \mathbb{C}$, and $|\alpha_0|^2 + |\alpha_1|^2 + |\beta_0|^2 + |\beta_1|^2 = 1$. Although there has been a geometrical formulation of few-qubit entanglement in terms of Hopf fibrations in Refs. [15, 16, 17], this is limited to only three Hopf fibrations which would impose a limit on the system's scalability. Here we use a Hopf bundle-like mapping similar to the one reported in Ref. [15] but instead of using the geometrical picture of the spheres of the total space of the bundle we resort to the Clifford algebra representation. This construction allows us to avoid the limit imposed by Hopf fibrations and generalizes to higher dimensions. The relevance to a geometrical interpretation of states shall be dealt with later, as now we will emphasize its algebraic properties and build a map from the Clifford $Cl(3)$ representation ($\tilde{C}l(3) \sim \mathbb{H} \oplus \mathbb{H}$) to S^4. We introduce the pair of quaternions $q_1 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 i_2$, and $q_2 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 i_2$. By

---

[*] E-mail address: `gerapaz@univalle.edu.co`
[†] Corresponding author.
E-mail address: `j.reina-estupinan@physics.ox.ac.uk`; Tel/Fax: +57 2 3394610/3393237

choosing the map $\pi : \tilde{C}l(3) \longrightarrow S^4$:

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi\rangle &= (q_1, q_2) \longmapsto \left(2q_2\bar{q}_1, |q_1|^2 - |q_2|^2\right) = \\ &\left(2[\beta_0\bar{\alpha}_0 + \beta_1\bar{\alpha}_1] + 2[\beta_1\alpha_0 - \beta_0\alpha_1]i_2,\right. \\ &\left.|\alpha_0|^2 + |\alpha_1|^2 - |\beta_0|^2 - |\beta_1|^2\right) , \qquad (1)\end{aligned}$$

we access all the information available from the first qubit and a component related to the so-called concurrence $\mathcal{C}$, a measure of the qubit system entanglement [5]. Here $\bar{x}$ denotes complex conjugation. Thus, the map reads

$$\left(2\bar{\rho}_{1(01)} + \mathcal{C}_1 i_2,\, \rho_{1(00)} - \rho_{1(11)}\right) , \qquad (2)$$

where $\rho_{n(ij)}$ denotes the one-qubit reduced density matrix of the n-th qubit. We point out that although we are keeping the map for its algebraic features, it is manifestly invariant under local SU(2) transformations and avoids the problem of defining charts as in the Hopf bundle picture. Such a map contains information about the first qubit entanglement, which should be symmetrical for the other qubit, and the issue here is how to recover it. In the two qubit case the other reduced density matrix can be recovered from the first one simply by exchanging α_1 with β_0. Of course this is equivalent to labeling the qubits in the other possible way, and in this sense it is a natural consequence of the arbitrariness introduced by the label we imposed. For higher dimensions, however, the number of possible labels is $N!$, so in principle we would have $N!$ different mappings. We now introduce the permutation group as a way of recovering the information for the other qubits. In fact, by permuting the particles we obtain the desired exchange, or equivalently, the other map:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(2(\bar{\alpha}_1\alpha_0 + \bar{\beta}_1\beta_0) + 2(\beta_1\alpha_0 - \beta_0\alpha_1)i_2,\, |\alpha_0|^2 + |\beta_0|^2 -\right. \\ &\left.(|\alpha_1|^2 + |\beta_1|^2)\right) = \left(2\bar{\rho}_{2(01)} + \mathcal{C}_2 i_2,\, \rho_{2(00)} - \rho_{2(11)}\right) . \qquad (3)\end{aligned}$$

As is to be expected, the term related to the concurrence is an invariant: the entanglement of the two particles remains the same, regardless of which one is measured. We will not go into the details of discussing the interpretations of $\mathcal{C}$ (see e.g. Ref. [17]), instead we shall focus on the fact that the map allows the construction of a measure of entanglement and that all possible maps are obtained through the permutation group.

Three-qubit entanglement and the third Hopf fibration.—Although the three-qubit scenario has been discussed from the point of view of Hopf fibrations [15, 16], and also from the perspective of the twistor geometry formalism [17], there is not a proper systematic characterization regarding multipartite entanglement measures. Here we provide such a description. We use the permutation group to decode the information available from the Clifford algebra representation. The Hilbert space for the three-qubit system is the tensor product of the 1-qubit Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3$ with the direct product basis where a pure three-qubit state reads $|\Psi\rangle = \alpha_0 |000\rangle + \alpha_1 |001\rangle + \beta_0 |010\rangle + \beta_1 |011\rangle + \delta_0 |100\rangle + \delta_1 |101\rangle + \gamma_0 |110\rangle + \gamma_1 |111\rangle$, $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_0, \beta_1, \delta_0, \delta_1, \gamma_0, \gamma_1 \in \mathbb{C}$, and $|\alpha_0|^2 + |\alpha_1|^2 + |\beta_0|^2 + |\beta_1|^2 + |\delta_0|^2 + |\delta_1|^2 + |\gamma_0|^2 + |\gamma_1|^2 = 1$. We perform a similar parametrization to the third Hopf fibration but from the $Cl(4)$ representation to S^8:

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi\rangle &= (o_1, o_2) = (q_1 + q_2 i_4, q_3 + q_4 i_4);\quad q_1 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 i_2, \\ q_2 &= \beta_0 + \bar{\beta}_1 i_2,\ q_3 = \delta_0 + \delta_1 i_2,\ q_4 = \gamma_0 + \bar{\gamma}_1 i_2 , \qquad (4)\end{aligned}$$

which results in the map $\pi' : \tilde{C}l(4) \longrightarrow S^8$:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi'(o_1, o_2) &= (2o_2\bar{o}_1, |o_1|^2 - |o_2|^2) = \qquad (5) \\ &(2C_1 + 2C_2 i_2 + 2C_3 i_4 + 2C_4 i_6, |o_1|^2 - |o_2|^2)\end{aligned}$$

with $C_1 = \bar{\alpha}_0\delta_0 + \delta_1\bar{\alpha}_1 + \gamma_0\bar{\beta}_0 + \bar{\beta}_1\gamma_1$, $C_2 = -\alpha_1\delta_0 + \delta_1\alpha_0 - (\bar{\beta}_1\bar{\gamma}_0 - \bar{\gamma}_1\bar{\beta}_0)$, $C_3 = -\beta_0\delta_0 + \gamma_0\alpha_0 - (\bar{\alpha}_1\bar{\gamma}_1 - \bar{\delta}_1\bar{\beta}_1)$, and $C_4 = -\bar{\delta}_1\bar{\beta}_0 + \bar{\alpha}_1\bar{\gamma}_0 - (\beta_1\delta_0 - \gamma_1\alpha_0)$, where $|o_1|^2 - |o_2|^2 = \rho_{1(00)} - \rho_{1(11)}$, and $1 = |\langle\Psi|\Psi\rangle|^4 = |\pi'(o_1, o_2)|^2$. Here C_1 is clearly the off diagonal element of the reduced density matrix ρ_1, but it is not trivial to see what exactly is the information that is available from the other C's. In the two-qubit case, we had only one component, which was interpreted as the concurrence. In the three-qubit scenario there is certainly more information to look at. Consider the following qubit configurations: i) $|\Psi_1\rangle \otimes |\Psi_{23}\rangle$, $C_2 = 0$, $C_3 = 0$, $C_4 = 0$, ii) $|\Psi_{12}\rangle \otimes |\Psi_3\rangle$, $C_2 = 0$, $C_3 \neq 0$, $C_4 \neq 0$, iii) $|\Psi_2\rangle \otimes |\Psi_{13}\rangle$, $C_2 \neq 0$, $C_3 = 0$, $C_4 \neq 0$, and iv) $|\Psi_1\rangle \otimes |\Psi_2\rangle \otimes |\Psi_3\rangle$, $C_2 = C_3 = C_4 = 0$. To some degree it may be tempting to say that for such configurations, the (123) case as we shall call it from now on, C_2 has information about the entanglement of (13) and C_3 of (12). An explicit calculation reads: i) case $1 \otimes (23)$: $2C_1 = 2\bar{\rho}_{1(01)}$, $2C_2 = 0$, $2C_3 = 0$, $2C_4 = 0$, ii) case $2 \otimes (13)$: $2C_1 = 2\bar{\rho}_{1(01)}$, $2C_2 = 2a^2 C_{(13)} + 2\bar{b}^2 \bar{C}_{(13)}$, $2C_3 = 0$, $2C_4 = 4\,\mathrm{Im}(abC_{(13)})$, iii) case $3 \otimes (12)$: $2C_1 = 2\bar{\rho}_{1(01)}$, $2C_2 = 0$, $2C_3 = 2a^2 C_{(12)} + 2\bar{b}^2 \bar{C}_{(12)}$, $2C_4 = 4\,\mathrm{Re}(abC_{(12)})$, where $\mathcal{C}_{(13)}$ denotes the concurrence of the entangled two-qubit state (13). It is clear that C_2 contains some information about the entanglement of (13) and C_3 about (12). We show next that, in contrast to the entanglement measure suggested in Ref. [15], this information is not complete and that it is actually the $N = 3$ permutation group which indicates the complete information available in the Cl representation. We write down the explicit transformations induced by the elements of the permutation group of three elements as follows:
a) $(123) \rightarrow (213)$: $\beta_1 \rightarrow \delta_1$, $\delta_0 \rightarrow \beta_0$, $\beta_0 \rightarrow \delta_0$, $\delta_1 \rightarrow \beta_1$, b) $(123) \rightarrow (321)$: $\alpha_1 \rightarrow \delta_0$, $\beta_1 \rightarrow \gamma_0$, $\delta_0 \rightarrow \alpha_1$, $\gamma_0 \rightarrow \beta_1$, c) $(123) \rightarrow (132)$: $\alpha_1 \rightarrow \beta_0$, $\beta_0 \rightarrow \alpha_1$, $\delta_1 \rightarrow \gamma_0$, $\gamma_0 \rightarrow \delta_1$, d) $(123) \rightarrow (312)$: $\alpha_1 \rightarrow \delta_0$, $\beta_0 \rightarrow \alpha_1$, $\beta_1 \rightarrow \delta_1$, $\delta_1 \rightarrow \gamma_0$, $\delta_0 \rightarrow \beta_0$, $\gamma_0 \rightarrow \beta_1$, e) $(123) \rightarrow (231)$: $\alpha_1 \rightarrow \beta_0$, $\beta_0 \rightarrow \delta_0$, $\beta_1 \rightarrow \gamma_0$, $\delta_0 \rightarrow \alpha_1$, $\delta_1 \rightarrow \beta_1$, $\gamma_0 \rightarrow \delta_1$. Hence, permuting the qubits is equivalent to redefining five new mappings through the equivalences obtained above:

$(123) \rightarrow (213)$:

$$\begin{aligned}C_1' &= \bar{\alpha}_0\beta_0 + \beta_1\bar{\alpha}_1 + \gamma_0\bar{\delta}_0 + \bar{\delta}_1\gamma_1,\ C_2' = \beta_1\alpha_0 - \alpha_1\beta_0 + \\ &\bar{\gamma}_1\bar{\delta}_0 - \bar{\delta}_1\bar{\gamma}_0,\ C_3' = \gamma_0\alpha_0 - \beta_0\delta_0 - (\bar{\beta}_1\bar{\delta}_1 - \bar{\gamma}_1\bar{\alpha}_1),\end{aligned}$$

$C'_4 = -\beta_0\delta_1 - \bar{\gamma}_0\bar{\alpha}_1 + \bar{\beta}_1\bar{\delta}_0 + \gamma_1\alpha_0$, $|o_1|^2 - |o_2|^2 = \rho_{2(00)} - \rho_{2(11)}$

$(123) \rightarrow (321)$:

$C'_1 = \bar{\alpha}_0\alpha_1 + \beta_1\bar{\beta}_0 + \delta_1\bar{\delta}_0 + \bar{\gamma}_0\gamma_1$, $C'_2 = \delta_1\alpha_0 - \delta_0\alpha_1 + \bar{\gamma}_1\bar{\beta}_0 - \bar{\gamma}_0\bar{\beta}_1$, $C'_3 = \beta_1\alpha_0 - \beta_0\alpha_1 + \bar{\delta}_1\bar{\gamma}_0 - \bar{\delta}_0\bar{\gamma}_1$, $C'_4 = -\gamma_0\alpha_1 + \bar{\delta}_0\bar{\beta}_1 - \bar{\beta}_1\bar{\delta}_0 + \gamma_1\alpha_0$, $|o_1|^2 - |o_2|^2 = \rho_{3(00)} - \rho_{3(11)}$

$(123) \rightarrow (132)$:

$C'_1 = \bar{\alpha}_0\delta_0 + \gamma_0\bar{\beta}_0 + \delta_1\bar{\alpha}_1 + \bar{\beta}_1\gamma_1$, $C'_2 = \gamma_0\alpha_0 - \beta_0\delta_0 - (\bar{\beta}_1\bar{\delta}_1 - \bar{\gamma}_1\bar{\alpha}_1)$, $C'_3 = \delta_1\alpha_0 - \delta_0\alpha_1 - (\bar{\beta}_0\bar{\gamma}_1 - \bar{\gamma}_0\bar{\beta}_1)$, $C'_4 = \bar{\beta}_0\bar{\delta}_1 - \bar{\gamma}_0\bar{\alpha}_1 - (\beta_1\delta_0 - \gamma_1\alpha_0)$, $|o_1|^2 - |o_2|^2 = \rho_{1(00)} - \rho_{1(11)}$

$(123) \rightarrow (312)$:

$C'_1 = \bar{\alpha}_0\beta_0 + \beta_1\bar{\alpha}_1 + \gamma_0\bar{\delta}_0 + \bar{\delta}_1\gamma_1$, $C'_2 = \gamma_0\alpha_0 - \delta_0\beta_0 + \bar{\gamma}_1\bar{\alpha}_1 - \bar{\delta}_1\bar{\beta}_1$, $C'_3 = \beta_1\alpha_0 - \alpha_1\beta_0 + \bar{\gamma}_0\bar{\delta}_1 - \bar{\delta}_0\bar{\gamma}_1$, $C'_4 = -\beta_0\delta_1 - \bar{\gamma}_0\bar{\alpha}_1 + \bar{\beta}_1\bar{\delta}_0 + \gamma_1\alpha_0$, $|o_1|^2 - |o_2|^2 = \rho_{2(00)} - \rho_{2(11)}$

$(123) \rightarrow (231)$:

$C'_1 = \bar{\alpha}_0\alpha_1 + \beta_1\bar{\beta}_0 + \delta_1\bar{\delta}_0 + \bar{\gamma}_0\gamma_1$, $C'_2 = \beta_1\alpha_0 - \beta_0\alpha_1 + \bar{\gamma}_1\bar{\delta}_0 - \bar{\gamma}_0\bar{\delta}_1$, $C'_3 = \delta_1\alpha_0 - \delta_0\alpha_1 + \bar{\beta}_1\bar{\gamma}_0 - \bar{\beta}_0\bar{\gamma}_1$, $C'_4 = \bar{\beta}_0\bar{\delta}_1 - \gamma_0\alpha_1 - \bar{\beta}_1\bar{\delta}_0 + \gamma_1\alpha_0$, $|o_1|^2 - |o_2|^2 = \rho_{3(00)} - \rho_{3(11)}$.

From this we see that (123) and (132) have information about the first qubit, (213) and (312) about the second qubit, and (321) and (231) about the third qubit. Although the density matrix information is the same for (123) and (132), the information of the entanglement available in (123) is not the same as that of (132) [26], and this is why the use of the *complete permutation group* of $N = 3$ particles is what gives the complete information available from the tripartite system. For higher dimensions, and once a map such as Eq. (5) is constructed, permutations will always yield similar maps with the first and last components related to the reduced density matrices of the system. A natural way of extracting the information hidden in the parametrization is given through the norm of the elements of the base space. We thus define the quantity K_1 as

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= |2C_2|^2 + |2C_3|^2 + |2C_4|^2 \\ &= 1 - |2C_1|^2 - ||o_1|^2 - |o_2|^2|^2 \\ &= 1 - 4|\rho_{1(01)}|^2 - |\rho_{1(00)} - \rho_{1(11)}|^2 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

which, after some manipulation, is equivalent to

$$K_1 = 2(1 - \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_1^2]) \ . \tag{7}$$

It is encouraging that this coincides with the Meyer-Wallach-Brennen quantities defined to measure entanglement in Ref. [23], which can be seen by rewriting the measure built by Meyer and Wallach [6] through an analysis of invariant polynomials and the linear entropy. Indeed, an arithmetical average over all permutations yields the Meyer-Wallach-Brennen measure

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{M} = \frac{1}{N!}\sum_{1}^{N!} K_i = \frac{1}{N!}\sum_{1}^{N!} 2(1 - \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_i^2]) = \\ = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{1}^{N} 2(1 - \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_i^2]) \equiv \frac{1}{N}\sum_{1}^{N} Q_i \ , \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where ρ_i are the reduced density matrices of one qubit accessible through the action of the permutation group. In the last equality we have used the fact that each K_i (ρ_i) appears with multiplicity $N - 1$. For higher dimensions we can build similar maps to Eq. (5) using higher Clifford algebra representations in such a way that

$$\begin{aligned} &|2C_2|^2 + |2C_3|^2 + |2C_4|^2 + \ldots + |2C_{2^{n-1}}|^2 = \\ &1 - |2\bar{\rho}_{1(01)}|^2 - |\rho_{1(00)} - \rho_{1(11)}|^2 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Multipartite qubit entanglement.—The case of dimension $N \geq 3$ requires special attention. It is known that the Meyer-Wallach-Brennen measure is not at all successful at accurately measuring the entanglement when $N \geq 3$. The first qualitatively different scenario we find is the $N = 4$ case [27], which allows the additional possibility of being factorized as a (2+2)-qubit state. In particular, the case of the direct product of two EPR states gives $\tilde{M} = 1$, which appears as an unexpected result since this is a semi factorizable state. This is so because, for such states, the corresponding reduced density matrices are equal to $\frac{1}{2}\hat{I}$ and hence the information about the entanglement available for each qubit is the same: maximal entanglement.

Scott [18] has addressed this issue by considering not only one qubit reduced density matrices, but the reduced density matrices of $m < N$ qubits, corresponding to other bipartitions: 2 + 2, 3 + 2, etc. He has proposed the measure

$$Q_m(\Psi) = \binom{N}{m}^{-1} \sum_{|S|=m} \frac{2^m}{2^m - 1}\left(1 - \mathrm{Tr}\left[\rho_S^2\right]\right) \ , \tag{10}$$

where $C_m^N = \binom{N}{m}$. The choice $N = \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$ would account for all possible bipartitions, and as any s-partition is necessarily included in a bipartition, then it should be enough just to consider bipartitions. In a similar spirit, Love *et al.* [24] proposed a geometrical average of the term over which the sum is performed in Eq. (10) as a way of characterizing global entanglement. Nevertheless, these type of measures have the inconvenience that they do not yield one for generalized GHZ states, as all their reduced density matrices have purity equal to 1/2 yielding a value equal to one only for the case of two qubit reduced density matrices.

Although this can, in principle, be overcome by introducing a proper normalization factor, we seek an alternate measure that can be averaged in a more satisfactory way, namely, that yields one for GHZ states and gives a non-zero value for maximally mixed density matrices. Our proposal is that the arithmetical and geometrical averages of such a quantity are enough to characterize the entanglement of a quantum state, quantifying it and deciding whether the entanglement is global (among all parties) or not (bifactorizable, ..., N-factorizable).

Based on the factorizability of a given density matrix, we propose an alternate strategy which is both economic and effective at quantifying multipartite entanglement. The basic idea is to characterize the degree of entanglement of a system through a probe quantity, say $\mathcal{P}$, that measures the degree of non-factorizability ($\rho_{AB} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$) of each pair of qudits.

Note that factorizability is only equivalent to separability in the case of pure density matrices. For the case of mixed density matrices, a factorizable density matrix $\rho = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ can indeed be rewritten as a separable matrix $\sum p_i \rho_A^i \otimes \rho_B^i$, however, the converse is not true (see e.g. the Werner states). We focus on qubit systems ($d = 2$).

First, we have to find a suitable candidate for this task. Several candidates can be thought of, e.g., the mutual information [19], the trace distance, and others [2]. For the sake of completeness in our analysis we consider two main quantities: i) The first quantity, which we term as the *quasi-concurrence* $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$, is based in the same eigenvalues λ_i of the concurrence [14], but considers a different combination to that defined in Ref. [14]. Thus, we consider, in decreasing order, the eigenvalues λ_i of the matrix $\sqrt{\rho_{AB}\tilde{\rho}_{AB}}$, where $\tilde{\rho}_{AB} = (\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2)\bar{\rho}_{AB}(\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2)$, in order to define $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB}) = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4$. Note that $\mathcal{Q}_C$ is non-negative, ranging from zero to one, and that for pure states is equivalent to the concurrence $C(\rho_{AB}) = \max\{0, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4\}$, as we only have one non-zero eigenvalue. Also, $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB}) = 0$ for factorizable density matrices, since all their eigenvalues are the same; and all the reduced density matrices within a generalized GHZ state $|GHZ\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2})(|0\rangle^{\otimes N} + |1\rangle^{\otimes N})$, yield $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB}) = 1$, thus being a well suited quantity for our purposes. ii) The second quantity, $\mathcal{F}r(A,B)$, has a more direct physical significance. This is proportional to the von Neumann's mutual information

$$\mathcal{F}r(A,B) \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\Big(S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB})\Big), \quad (11)$$

where $S(\rho)$ is the von Neumann's entropy associated to the density matrix ρ [2]. For example, for a generalized state $|GHZ\rangle$, all the two qubit reduced density matrices yield $\mathcal{F}r(A,B) = 1/2$; a W-state $|W\rangle = (1/\sqrt{3})(|100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle)$ has $\mathcal{F}r(A,B) \sim 0.46$ for all (A,B), and a fully factorizable state yields $\mathcal{F}r(A,B) = 0$.

Second, we define geometric and arithmetic averages in order to obtain more information about the state and its type of entanglement. We define the arithmetic average

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}(A,B))\big(C_2^N\big)^{-1} \sum \mathcal{P}(A,B)\ , \quad (12)$$

and the geometric average

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}(A,B))\Big(\prod \mathcal{P}(A,B)\Big)^{\left(C_2^N\right)^{-1}}\ , \quad (13)$$

where $\mathcal{P}(A,B)$ are the probe quantities: $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$ and $\mathcal{F}r(\rho_{AB})$ in our case, and the sum and product are over all possible pairs of qubits. We note that $\mathcal{P}(A,B) = \mathcal{P}(B,A)$ and that the normalization factor, $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}(A,B))$, is introduced so the measure yields one for generalized GHZ states. We have $\mathcal{N} = (1 + (d-1)(1 - \delta_{2,N}))$ if we are averaging $\mathcal{F}r$ or $\mathcal{N} = 1$ if we are using the quasi-concurrence.

The generalization to the case of mixed states can be achieved through the expressions [5]

$$\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \min \sum p_i \mathcal{M}(\rho_i)\ , \quad (14)$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(\rho) = \min \sum p_i \mathcal{G}(\rho_i)\ , \quad (15)$$

for the arithmetical and geometrical averages respectively. The minimum is intended over all possible decompositions. Note that in the two-qubit case, $\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \mathcal{G}(\rho)$ and they reduce to the concurrence defined by Wooters [14]. It is important to note that the probe quantities are directly applied without minimizations when they are acting as probes on a multipartite quantum state; when analyzing bipartite states, however, they act as full measures so they operate through minimizing mechanisms such as the ones given above.

Both quantities give different information about the type of entanglement of the quantum state, namely if it has global entanglement (among all parties) or only among some of the parties (bipartitions, tripartitions, etc.), and, in conjunction, they give us the possibility of fully characterizing the entanglement of a pure quantum state.

The arithmetic average varies between zero and one: it equals zero if and only if all $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$'s (or $\mathcal{F}r(A,B)$'s) are zero, that is, if the state is completely factorizable, and equals one if and only if all $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$'s are 1 (or $\mathcal{F}r(A,B)$'s are 1/2), i.e. if we have an N-qubit maximally entangled state. It can be shown [20] that the measure defined in this way is both additive and strongly super additive, two properties that are desired but usually not satisfied by most entanglement measures [21]. Thus, we provide a measure of entanglement that accurately quantifies the amount of entanglement of a pure quantum state. This measure is on its own, however, unable to determine whether a state is genuine globally entangled or not. For example, a bi-factorizable N-qubit state could yield the same value as a globally entangled state.

The geometric average also varies between zero and one. This equals one if and only if all $\mathcal{Q}_C(\rho_{AB})$'s ($\mathcal{F}r(A,B)$'s) are 1 (1/2), that is, if we have a maximally entangled N-qubit state. However, and in contrast with the arithmetic measure, it equals zero if at least one of the $\mathcal{P}(A,B)$ vanishes, i.e., if the state is at least bifactorizable, thus quantifying *global* entanglement. Higher factorizabilities, e.g. trifactorizable or N-factorizable states would have even more vanishing $\mathcal{P}(A,B)$'s.

These two measures lead us to classify the set of pure multipartite states between the ones with non vanishing $\mathcal{G}$, i.e. genuine globally entangled states[20], and the rest, which may or not be entangled at all, information that can be obtained through the arithmetical average $\mathcal{M}$. We recall that according to our definition a state is genuine globally entangled if after measuring one qubit we gain some information about all of the other qubits in the register, that is if $\mathcal{P}(A,B) \neq 0$ for all (A,B). Both measures provide a faithful way of discriminating between pure multipartite quantum states. We can further explore the structure of the globally entangled states; there are two distinct types: the ones with the same $\mathcal{P}(A,B)$ for all pairs of qubits (homogeneously entangled states) and the states that posses different values of non-factorizability for all their pairs (heterogeneously entangled states). In the context of this classification, our calculations lead us to define a GHZ state as the homogeneously entangled state with the highest possible average of $\mathcal{P}(A,B)$.

We introduce this definition because, if we consider the case of the quantity $\mathcal{F}r$ [28], given an arbitrary state we may find higher values of correlations between a pair of qubits, e.g., i) $|EPR\rangle \otimes |EPR\rangle$ states, and ii) maximally entangled mixed states [22], but this does not mean that their degree of entanglement is higher than that of the $|GHZ\rangle$ state. For the case i) $\mathcal{F}r(A,B) = 1 > 1/2$ for $(A,B) = (1,2),(3,4)$, and $\mathcal{F}r(A,B) = 0$ for $(A,B) = (1,3),(1,4),(2,3),(2,4)$, yielding $\mathcal{M} = 2/3 < 1 = \mathcal{M}_{GHZ}$. Note that $\mathcal{G} = 0 < 1 = \mathcal{G}_{GHZ}$. For the case ii) consider the pure state $|MEMS\rangle = \sqrt{1-x}\,|0101\rangle + \sqrt{x}/2(|0000\rangle + |0011\rangle + |1100\rangle + |1111\rangle)$, built as a purification of the maximally mixed entangled state proposed by Munro *et al.* [22]: a direct calculation yields $\mathcal{F}r(1,2) = \mathcal{F}r(3,4) > 1/2 = \mathcal{F}r(1,2)(\rho_{GHZ})$ for $x \to 1$. Despite this result, it is not difficult to check that $\mathcal{F}r(1,3) = \mathcal{F}r(1,4) = \mathcal{F}r(2,3) = \mathcal{F}r(2,4) < 1/4$ which gives $\mathcal{M} < \mathcal{M}_{GHZ}$, and also $\mathcal{G} < \mathcal{G}_{GHZ}$. In this way we see that, although these states exhibit a higher degree of non-factorizability among some of their pairs, on average they possess less entanglement than the GHZ state, which possesses the maximum possible entanglement on average. It is interesting that this result implies the possibility that weaker (less correlated) links may be taking place in spin chains or related systems [25].

We presented a geometrical formalism which is suited to describing the Meyer-Wallach [6] measure in its Brennen's [23] version, thus generalizing previous work by Bernevig [15], Mosseri [16], and Levay [17]. We also introduced, through the concept of probe quantities characterizing the non-factorizability of a bipartite density matrix, the construction of arithmetic and geometric entanglement measures for quantifying multipartite pure states, which were able to distinguish between globally and partially entangled states and that accurately quantified the degree of entanglement of an N-qubit system.

Acknowledgments. We thank T. Brandes, C. Emary, and H. Ocampo for useful discussions. JHR thanks S. Reina-Steers for useful distractions. GAPS thanks G. H. Paz, I. Silva, D. F. Gutierrez, and G. R. Paz for continual support. We gratefully acknowledge financial support from COLCIENCIAS under Research Grants No. 1106-14-17903 and No. 1106-05-13828.

[1] C. H. Bennett and D. P. DiVincenzo, Nature **404**, 247 (2000).
[2] See, e.g. M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, CUP (2000).
[3] C. H. Bennett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
[4] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
[5] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani, E-print arXiv:quant-ph/0504163.
[6] D. A. Meyer and N. Wallach, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4273 (2002).
[7] J. G. Luque and J. Y. Thibon, J. Phys. A **39**, 371 (2006).
[8] C. Emary, J. Phys. A **37**, 8293 (2004).
[9] V. Vedral *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2275 (1997).
[10] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413 (1996).
[11] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
[12] P. Levay, J. Phys. A **37**, 1821 (2004); **38**, 9075 (2005).
[13] G. Jaeger *et al.* Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022318 (2003).
[14] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000).
[15] B. A. Bernevig and H. Chen, J. Phys. A **36**, 8325 (2003).
[16] R. Mosseri and R. Dandoloff, J. Phys. A **34**, 10243 (2001).
[17] P. Levay, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **37**, 1821 (2004).
[18] A. J. Scott, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052330 (2004).
[19] N. J. Cerf and C. Adami, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 5194 (1997).
[20] G. A. Paz-Silva and J. H. Reina, E-print arXiv:quant-ph/0610017.
[21] M. Christandl, D.Phil. thesis, University of Cambridge, E-print arXiv:quant-ph/0604183.
[22] W. J. Munro, D. F. V. James, A. G. White and P. G. Kwiat, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 030302 (2001).
[23] G. K. Brennen, Quant. Inf. and Comp. **3**, 616 (2003).
[24] P. J. Love *et al.*, E-print arXiv:quant-ph/0602143.
[25] S. Bose, E-print arXiv:cond-mat/0610024.
[26] However, an invariant common to both can be constructed using the norm of the vector.
[27] For higher N we would have different partitions, e.g. $6 = 2+2+2 = 3+3 = ...$ etc.
[28] If, instead of $\mathcal{F}r$, we consider the quasi-concurrence, the definition is even more compact; it would then read: a GHZ state is that for which $\mathcal{P}(A,B)$ is maximum for all reduced bipartite density matrices.